

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/403,487	Applicant(s) OKAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Kenneth A Parker	Art Unit 2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kenneth A Parker.

(3) Robert Downs.

(2) David Chung.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 May 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sonehara.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that Sonehara figure 11, 1102 was not the black state of 1101. Applicant's representative asks where is the dark state shown in the reference, and argued that their display produces at the reflector linearly polarized light of different orientations in a white display and pointed to the clause that begins "to perform the white display" as the part of the claim that addresses this limitation; and indicated that they believed that the Itoh reference did not have the claimed retardation values for the individual retardation plates. The examiners indicated that the references and claims would be reviewed in accordance with the presented arguments.